

so what?" Well, so what is a big difference in whether more money gets out to the students or not.

There is a big difference. For example, in title I, we have a cap by law that says that no more than 1 percent of the money that goes out to Title I can be used for administration at the State level. One cent of every dollar, that is all, no more; so that 99 cents actually gets to the schools and the students.

However, under Title VI, 15 percent of the money that goes out to the States is held at the State level; 15 cents out of every dollar is held at the State level. The remaining 85 cents then goes out to the school districts.

Title I is more efficient and will get more resources into the classrooms and schools—99 cents of every dollar, to actually hire the teachers and reduce class size. What the Republicans are saying is, turn it over to the States. They keep 15 cents and send only 85 cents to the schools.

So I submit, Mr. President, that if you really want to cut administrative costs, if you want to get the most money out there to get the most bang for the buck, let's put the money in Title I and not the Title VI program.

There seems to be another strain going on around here and that is that "the Federal Government is doing too much in education. The Federal Government should do less. We have got leave this to States and local communities."

I would be the first to defend and the last person standing in defense of the right of local jurisdictions to control their schools. That does not mean that the Federal Government does not have a role to play in helping those schools. I believe it does; a significant role. And we have owned up to that over the years. But to say that the Federal Government is doing too much, I think, is to ignore what we have done in the past.

In 1980—of every dollar that went for elementary and secondary education in America, for every dollar that went out, the Federal Government provided about 10 cents. So about 10 cents of every dollar that went out for elementary and secondary education came from the Federal Government. That was 1980.

To those who say that today, in 1998, the Federal Government is doing too much in elementary and secondary education, I point out that from that point in 1980 to now the Federal Government is only providing about 6 percent of the money for elementary and secondary education. In other words, in the intervening 18 years, the Federal role in support of elementary and secondary education has been cut by almost.

I always tell my constituents in Iowa, and other places, obviously, you wonder why your property taxes are going up. That is why. In order to keep the schools up and to meet their constitutional requirements to provide for

new technology, to help fix up crumbling schools, the States then have to put it back on the local jurisdictions, and they have to raise property taxes. That is why the property taxes seem to be going up all over this country.

So I always say to people, if you want property tax relief, the best thing is to get the Federal Government back up to where we were in 1980. You do that and you will find out we will be able to fix our crumbling schools, we will be able to hire 100,000 teachers and reduce class size, we will be able to wire the schools for the Internet, and get the technology these kids need at an early level.

Mr. President, if we had just held constant from where we were in 1980 to today—do not increase but do not decrease; simply held constant—the Federal Government's share of elementary and secondary education would be about a 44-percent increase. We would be providing an additional \$10 billion more each year our local schools. And any way you cut it, that spells property tax relief. That spells more technology for our schools.

If I might digress just a moment, there are some who think that our kids in elementary school have to learn the basics first and then they can get on to computers. There are some who say that what our kids need is a No. 2 lead pencil and a Big Chief tablet; they learn that first, and then they can go into computers. They fail to recognize that the No. 2 lead pencil and the Big Chief tablet of today are the desktop computer.

I know the occupant of the Chair is a little bit younger than I am, but when I was a kid in a two-room country schoolhouse in rural Iowa back in the 1940s and early 1950s, we had a blackboard and a piece of chalk. That was our computer. We used that blackboard and a piece of chalk; we had our Big Chief tablet and No. 2 lead pencil. That might have been OK for my generation. It is not OK for this generation; it is not OK for the kids today. It is not something they use after they get smart, it is something they use to help them learn smart, to understand what we are going to need in the 21st century to meet our needs.

We could have that if the Federal Government would meet its obligations, if we just held constant where we were in 1980. That is what we are trying to do. We are trying to support the President's goal of reducing class size and getting 100,000 teachers out there. We are trying to support the President in his goal of getting money out to help fix our crumbling schools, so the kids don't have to go out and learn in trailers, so we don't have 30 to 35 kids in the class but something like 18 or 19, at the maximum, in any class.

Last, we hear all the speeches about turning the money over to the States and let them decide how to respond. That all sounds good. What about all of the bipartisan accomplishments that we also hear about in this Congress?

We passed the Higher Education Act; we reauthorized the vocational and technical education bill; we expanded the Federal Charter Schools Program. Senators on both sides of the aisle brag about this. How can you brag about it in one breath and turn around and say that we have to turn over all the money to the States? I am a little confused about that. If you are proud of the vocational and technical education and the fact that the Federal Government has supported it and we just reauthorized it, how can you then turn around and said we shouldn't do any of this?

There is a role, a limited role, for the Federal Government, but a very powerful and important role. I believe this Congress is turning its back on its responsibilities, unless in the closing days of this session we can get an agreement to provide resources to reduce class size and fix our crumbling schools. We need the money in there right now so the kids don't have to go out in trailers in the back of the school to learn.

I hope in the closing days we will be able to get the education funding that we need.

#### CHILD LABOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I turn my attention to another issue that is closely akin to education, an issue I have been working on for a long time, one which has come to the front now because of all the negotiations going on. That is the issue of child labor.

In January of this year, my staff, Rosemary Gutierrez, and I traveled to Nepal, Bangladesh, India, and Pakistan to look at the issue of child labor. While we were in Nepal, the exotic city of Katmandu, I met with a young man who had been a former child laborer. He told me about the awful conditions that were in some of these countries, yet the official government line is, there is no child labor; it is prohibited.

On a Sunday evening, right after it got dark, about dusk, we got into an unmarked car—the former child laborer, a driver, my staff person, and I—and drove to the outskirts of Katmandu to a carpet factory. It was thought by my host, this young man who had been a former child laborer, that the owner of the factory was not going to be there. He kind of knew the guard at the gate and said we could get through. So we drove out to the outskirts. Sure enough, there was a gate, there was a wire fence. The guard let us through. We went up, and the young man talked to him in Nepalese, since I don't speak Nepalese, and we were let through.

What was on the outside of the gate before we entered? This sign right here, in Nepalese and in English. This is the sign; I took this picture with my camera. The brick wall states:

Child labor [sic] under the age of 14 is strictly prohibited.

Right on the gate it says this. I took the picture. We went through a gate,

down a long hallway, turned left; there were doors; we opened the doors and walked in.

Remember:

Child labor under the age of 14 is strictly prohibited.

Here are some more pictures I took. These are kids working at the looms. We asked our host to ask them their ages. We have a boy here who is 9 and a girl about 12. That is just two of them. This place was loaded with kids that age, working on a Sunday at 7 o'clock in the evening; it was getting dark. They are still working full-time in dirty, dusty conditions, making these carpets.

Here is another picture I took. Again, don't tell me these are phony pictures. I took them with my camera. I was there. More kids are working at their looms—kids, 11, 12, 13, 10, 9 years old. And I have other pictures. I had my staff take a photo with me included with the kids to show that I was there. Again, there are other kids—not the same kids—other kids in the same place, all of whom basically are under the age of 14—there were some older, I admit, but a lot of them under the age of 14, working.

What we are trying to do is do something about the issue of child labor. What can we do? In 1930, Congress passed what was infamously known as the Smoot-Hawley bill. Aside from the bad things Smoot-Hawley did in terms of restricting trade, there was section 307, which is part of the law today, which has been in existence since 1930. I will read the first sentence:

All goods, wares, articles, and merchandise, mined, produced or manufactured, wholly or in part, in any foreign country by convict labor or/and forced labor, or/and indentured labor, under penal sanctions, shall not be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation thereof is hereby prohibited, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for the enforcement of this provision.

It covers forced and indentured labor. We have prohibited that ever since.

A couple of years ago, I made an inquiry of the Department of the Treasury. I asked if any items made with forced or indentured child labor had been prohibited from entering the United States under this section on forced labor. To my surprise, the answer was no. Furthermore, the Department of Treasury was not sure whether or not forced or indentured child labor was included in the definition of "forced or indentured labor."

This is outrageous. The law says "forced or indentured labor," but we don't know if it covers kids.

Last year, during consideration of the fiscal year 1998 Treasury-Postal appropriations bill, I inserted a provision which instructed the U.S. Customs Service to block from entry into the United States any imports made by forced or indentured child labor as they are inherently imports made with forced and indentured labor.

However, this was only a 1-year provision. It was on an appropriations bill. But it passed. It was supported by the House and Senate. But it only lasted 1 year. That year is now up. That provision no longer is valid because it was only good for 1 year.

In order to ensure that goods made with forced and indentured child labor are treated the same as goods made with forced or indentured adult labor, we need to change the law permanently. Well, this summer, the Senate approved my amendment to reflect the intent of Congress to include forced and indentured child labor under this umbrella. My amendment was quite simple. The Tariff Act already says that goods made with forced or indentured labor are prohibited from entering the U.S. market. I included the words "forced and indentured child labor," so there is no ambiguity in the statute's interpretation.

Unfortunately, my amendment was struck from the bill during conference because Members did not feel a tariff measure belonged on the defense authorization bill. I was told to find a more relevant measure. Well, I have it. Congress is considering a tariff measure, H.R. 4342, the Miscellaneous Tariff and Technical Corrections Act of 1998, which passed the House on August 4. It has a lot of provisions in it. There is page after page after page of technical corrections to the tariff laws. Examples: Over 100 provisions that would suspend or reduce the tariff applicable to certain specified products, most of these being a wide variety of chemicals and organic pigments, including a temporary suspension on the duties for a variety of HIV medications and anticancer drugs and other trade-related provisions—hundreds of provisions.

Here is the report. As you go through it, there is page after page, including things like pigment yellow No. 151, pigment yellow No. 175, chloroacetone, benzenepropanal. Section 2143, textile machinery. Section 2144. Here are some things and chemicals I can't even pronounce that are being changed here. A lot of chemicals. Here is 4-hexylresorcinol. I don't even know what it is.

My point is this: There are hundreds of tariff changes in this bill. This is a tariff bill. My amendment on child labor amends the Tariff Act of 1930—a tariff measure. So we have the right vehicle. But, Mr. President, because the House passed it on suspension, it came over here and it was never brought out on the floor for debate so that I could offer this amendment—an amendment which is noncontroversial. It passed the Senate twice, and passed the House once. It has been in effect for one year because it was on an appropriations bill. I just want to get an amendment to the tariff bill to indicate that forced and indentured labor includes forced and indentured "child" labor.

Well, I don't know why we can't include it. I did have a conversation on

the telephone with the chairman of the Finance Committee last week. I asked why this noncontroversial provision couldn't be put in. I don't know that anyone would come to the floor and object to taking the Tariff Law of 1930, which forbids the importation of goods made by forced and indentured labor, and adding the words "child labor," so that forced and indentured labor would cover forced and indentured child labor. Would someone come to the floor and say, OK, we have to keep everything out of this country made with forced and indentured adult labor, but if you have forced and indentured child labor, that's OK, we will bring it in. Does anybody want to come to the floor and make that argument? I doubt it. I don't think anybody would want to make that argument, because it doesn't make sense. I think we are all fairly reasonable people around here.

So I would like to get my amendment on the tariff bill—an amendment that, as I said, passed both Houses—it passed this body twice—and has been in effect for one year. I didn't hear any hue and cry from anyone. As far as I know, I never had one corporation, one business, one importer yell about it or say that "this is awful that we are keeping goods out made with forced and indentured child labor." My amendment gives our Treasury Department, our Customs people, is a permanent law whereby it would say, in unambiguous terms, forced and indentured labor means forced and indentured child labor, also.

Now, could there be an objection that costs money? Well, I have an opinion here from CBO, from back on July 16 of this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for another 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I hope not to even take that long. Here is the analysis from CBO on my amendment: "This proposal would not affect direct spending or receipts, so there would be no pay-as-you-go scoring under section 252 of the Balanced Budget Act."

There you are. It doesn't cost any money. It has no effect on the budget. It has been passed. All I want to do is get it added to this bill and, since I didn't have a chance to offer it as an amendment, I only have one recourse. I put a hold on the tariff bill. I don't want it to pass by unanimous consent. Am I opposed to the tariff bill? No. I assume everything in it is fine. It has all been cleared. The chairman of the Finance Committee assured me that it has been cleared by everybody. I don't know every section and title, but I assume it's all right. I want the opportunity to put this into permanent law on a tariff bill. I don't know when the next tariff bill will come across the

Senate floor. I don't believe this language can be held hostage simply because the Senate didn't do its work. The House passed this on August 4. We had plenty of time to take it up here, but we never brought it up. So I am left in the position of having to do something that I don't like to do, which is to put a hold on the bill and not give my consent to pass the bill by unanimous consent, unless we can get this amendment added. An amendment, which I swear, I would like to know one person that could come over here and argue against it. I don't think you could find such a person.

So I see no reason why it can't be added. It's time that we say about kids what we said in 1930—in 1930—what we said about adults. This Congress said that no goods, no merchandise, or anything that is mined by forced or indentured labor can come into this country. Here we are, 68 years later, and we can't add the words "forced and indentured child labor."

Nonsense. I hope that those who are working on the tariff bill would be so kind as to include this amendment so that we can take away any ambiguity, clean it up once and for all, and prohibit the importation of goods made with child labor.

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR DALE BUMPERS OF ARKANSAS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes to talk in as glowing terms as I can about a great friend, a great Senator, and a person I have admired both as a Senator and as a plain good person for all the years I have been in Washington. And he is leaving us. He is retiring at the end of this session. I am speaking about perhaps the epitome of what I believe to be a good Senator, and that Senator is DALE BUMPERS of Arkansas.

I am really going to miss him, and this country is going to miss him as well. So will this Chamber. He is truly one of the finest Senators to have ever graced this body. He has done so many good things over the years. It is hard to know where to begin.

I know he started out as someone in the Marine Corps. As a Navy person I will not hold that against him. I can overlook that. But then he came back to Arkansas and practiced law, had a small business, and even raised some cattle. He had good practical experience, and knows the people of Arkansas and he knows the people of this country. The people of Arkansas rewarded that—first as Governor, and now finishing his tenure as a Senator. He was elected by more than 60 percent of the vote in the last two terms.

Senator BUMPERS came to the Senate at the same time I came to the House in 1974. For 24 years he has been here.

Someone said once about Senators in general that some Senators come here to coin a phrase, or coin a slogan, and think they have solved the problem. But not DALE BUMPERS. He has worked

very hard to solve the problems of this country.

He has been a close friend, a person of immense common sense. When it comes to helping farmers, seniors, working people, and children there is no better person to have as an ally than DALE BUMPERS. He stuck to what he believed. He had the determination to get the job done with a strong commitment to the people of Arkansas. He is certainly one of the finest orators and debaters this Chamber has ever seen. He has led the fight in the Senate against government waste.

I loved to listen to his speeches on that \$12 billion boondoggle called the superconductor super collider. And he won. Unfortunately, we wasted a lot of money on it. But, the people finally came to their senses and saw it as the boondoggle that it was.

I wasn't in the Senate at the time. I was in the House working to kill that other boondoggle called the Clinch River breeder reactor. Boy, you would think at that time it was the most important thing to civilization that we built that breeder reactor. But finally people came to their senses, and we stopped it. And we are better and we are stronger because of it. We saved billions of dollars that would have been wasted. DALE led the fight on that in the Senate.

He has led the fight against other wasteful spending such as star wars and the space station.

I believe that he has finally brought home to the American conscience the issue of mining interests and the abuse of our public lands and the fact that we need to update our laws.

Anyway, with a common sense approach he has been a strong ally on the Appropriations Committee where we need that kind of common sense approach.

On the Agriculture Committee, he placed the needs of America's rural communities at the top of the national debate including rural housing and rural economic development. He has been the strongest fighter for protecting the environment. On the Clean Air Act, and Clean Water Act, DALE BUMPERS has been in the forefront of America's fight to keep our country clean.

As the National Journal put it, DALE BUMPERS is the Senator to whom "other Senators pay attention."

In numerous polls of Senate staffers, DALE BUMPERS has consistently ranked as one of the best liked Senators.

So we are going to miss him when we start the 106th Congress in January. We are going to miss DALE and his eloquence, his determination and his stick-to-it-ness.

So to the entire Bumpers family, DALE and Betty, their children—Brent, Bill and Brooke—and their five grandchildren, I want to extend my gratitude, and the gratitude of the citizens of my State, that I am so proud to represent, for loaning DALE to us for the past 24 years. America is a much better place because of DALE'S service in the Senate.

Mr. President, I want to close on the one note—the one area in which DALE has devoted so much of his time and effort, along with Betty on protecting our children from illnesses and diseases that have ravaged kids since time immemorial.

No one has fought harder for childhood vaccinations, and to make them universal, affordable, and accessible than DALE and Betty Bumpers.

So in recognition of their contributions, the Appropriations Committee, on which DALE served, voted unanimously, Republican and Democrats, to name a new vaccine facility at the National Institutes of Health after Senator BUMPERS and his wife, Betty. This new facility, now under construction, will be named the "DALE and Betty Bumpers Vaccine Research Facility."

As I said, DALE has been our resident expert on immunization since early in his Senate career. He has been a tireless advocate for funding to purchase vaccines and provide the public health system with the resources necessary to deliver those vaccines to the children who are most in need. He advocated a grant incentive program in the Senate that the Appropriations Committee has used each year to reward States that have been successful in preventing unnecessary diseases.

So there have been a lot of tributes that have been paid to DALE. But, the most lasting tribute will be his and Betty Bumpers' name on that research facility at NIH because, that is truly where his heart has been in making sure that kids in places like rural Arkansas and rural Iowa, and all over America—including our inner cities—to make sure they have a healthy start in life by getting immunized. To me that says it all about DALE BUMPERS.

We are going to miss him. I hope that he doesn't go too far away. I for one look forward to his continued advice and counsel as I serve out my career in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I ask unanimous consent to proceed in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE WORK INCENTIVES IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1998

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, we must pass the Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1998 in this Congress.

It seems like so long ago that when we introduced bill, I remember Bob Dole, who has been a hero with disabilities over the years being a disabled man himself, coming forward to us with this legislation, or to help on this legislation, and told his life story, and how incredibly important it was for him as an individual to be able to get back into the workforce. As we all know, he did that so successfully.